The Fractured Path to Peace: Understanding Its Complexity, Fragility, and the Role of the Children of God

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

March 2, 2025

Peace is often spoken of as an ideal—something that, if achieved, will bring an end to conflict and suffering. However, history reveals a different reality: peace is neither self-sustaining nor inevitable. It is fragile, complex, and often counterintuitive. Many assume that peace is simply the absence of war, a passive state that emerges when violence ceases. In truth, peace requires constant vigilance, deliberate action, and at times, struggle against the forces that seek to undermine it. This paper explores the nature of peace as an emergent phenomenon—one that must be continuously maintained rather than permanently secured. Drawing from history, theology, psychology, and complex systems theory, we examine why peace so often eludes humanity and why its pursuit demands more than mere diplomacy or temporary agreements. At the heart of this discussion is the role of the Children of God, those who are called to be peacemakers, not merely peacekeepers. Their task is not to preserve the status quo but to transform the conditions that make conflict inevitable, ensuring that peace remains possible in an ever-divided world.

Keywords: peace, conflict resolution, peacemaking, peacekeeping, emergent systems, war and peace, theology of peace, Matthew 5:9, geopolitics, diplomacy, complex systems theory, history of peace, spiritual duty, social justice, reconciliation, nonviolence, pacifism, power dynamics, human psychology, international relations, conflict transformation, Children of God, Jesus and peace, moral responsibility, peace studies.

1. Introduction

Throughout human history, peace has been a universal aspiration, yet it has never been a permanent reality. Every civilization has sought peace, whether through diplomacy, treaties, or force, but none have been able to sustain it indefinitely. This raises a fundamental question: why has the world never achieved lasting peace?

The prevailing assumption is that peace should be simple—merely the absence of war or conflict. However, history demonstrates that this is a flawed and incomplete view. When war ends, tension does not disappear; it merely shifts into other forms, whether political, economic, or cultural. Often, what is called "peace" is little more than an uneasy truce, a fragile balance that can be disrupted at any moment. This reveals a deeper truth: peace is not a passive state but an active, dynamic process that requires constant effort, wisdom, and vigilance.

This paradox—that peace is both the highest human aspiration and the most unstable condition—demands deeper examination. If peace were natural, it would not require extraordinary effort to maintain. If peace were inevitable, it would not have been broken so consistently throughout history. Instead, peace appears to be something counterintuitive, something that does not sustain itself but must be deliberately chosen, cultivated, and defended.

If peace is so difficult to achieve and maintain, then who is responsible for carrying its burden? This paper argues that peace cannot exist without those who actively commit themselves to it—those who see beyond the immediate conflicts and divisions of the world and work toward reconciliation, justice, and enduring stability. In biblical terms, these individuals are described as the Children of God, those who are called to be peacemakers in a world that does not naturally seek peace. As Jesus declared, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God" (Matthew 5:9).

This paper will explore the reasons why peace is so difficult to achieve, the misconceptions that prevent it, and the paradoxes that make its pursuit counterintuitive. It will examine historical and systemic barriers to lasting peace and argue that its preservation requires individuals and societies committed to a higher vision of order, justice, and reconciliation—not merely as an ideal, but as an active, continuous struggle. Peace is not something that simply happens; it is

something that must be chosen, protected, and fought for in a way that does not itself descend into violence and destruction.

If peace is to be anything more than a temporary pause between conflicts, then it must be sustained by those who understand its complexity and fragility. It must be upheld not through passive hope, but through intentional action, wisdom, and an unshakable commitment to its cause. Peace does not belong to those who wait for it to arrive—it belongs to those who make it their duty to build it, sustain it, and defend it against the forces that would tear it apart.

2. The Misconception of Peace as a Fixed State

One of the greatest barriers to achieving lasting peace is the widespread misconception that peace is a fixed state, something that, once achieved, remains stable and self-sustaining. This belief leads to false assumptions about what peace actually is and how it can be maintained. Throughout history, many societies have treated peace as either the mere absence of war, a compromise between conflicting parties, or a passive condition that will naturally emerge if conflict is avoided. However, each of these assumptions has failed in practice, leading to the repeated breakdown of peace across civilizations and eras.

False Assumptions About Peace

Peace as the Absence of War

The most common misunderstanding is that peace simply means the cessation of armed conflict. Under this definition, a society that is not actively engaged in war is considered to be in a state of peace. However, history shows that conflict does not truly end when violence stops. Wars often leave behind deep wounds—psychological, economic, and political—which, if not addressed, can manifest as new forms of conflict. These unresolved tensions may appear as cold wars, ideological struggles, or economic oppression, all of which can be just as destructive as direct violence, albeit in more subtle ways.

For example, the Treaty of Versailles, which officially ended World War I, did not eliminate the underlying grievances that had led to the war. Instead, it imposed harsh penalties on Germany, fostering resentment and economic instability that

contributed directly to the outbreak of World War II. Similarly, the mere absence of violence between racial or ethnic groups within a country does not mean that peace has been achieved if systemic injustice and inequality persist.

Peace as Compromise

Another flawed notion is that peace is simply a negotiated compromise between warring factions. While diplomacy is a vital tool in peacemaking, the assumption that any agreement guarantees lasting stability ignores the fact that forced or superficial compromises often fail to resolve the root causes of conflict.

History is filled with peace treaties that served only as temporary solutions, ultimately leading to renewed hostilities. The Munich Agreement of 1938, for example, was an attempt to appease Adolf Hitler by allowing Germany to annex parts of Czechoslovakia in exchange for a promise of no further territorial demands. This "peaceful compromise" did not prevent World War II but instead emboldened Nazi aggression. Likewise, many modern ceasefires between opposing factions serve only as pauses in ongoing conflicts, rather than as true resolutions.

For peace to be sustainable, it must be just, balanced, and rooted in a deeper reconciliation of interests and identities. A compromise that simply silences one side’s grievances without addressing them will only delay conflict, not prevent it.

Peace as Passivity

A third dangerous misconception is that peace is a passive condition, something that will naturally arise if people simply refrain from conflict. This perspective assumes that avoiding war is enough, that peace is the default state of human society. However, history shows that inaction in the face of injustice does not preserve peace—it allows conditions for future conflict to grow.

One of the most tragic examples of this assumption is the failure of many world powers to intervene early in the rise of totalitarian regimes. In the 1930s, as Nazi Germany expanded and violated multiple treaties, Western democracies largely stood by, believing that avoiding confrontation would preserve peace. Instead, their inaction emboldened aggression, ultimately leading to the most devastating war in human history.

Similarly, societies that tolerate deep economic inequalities, systemic discrimination, or political oppression may appear peaceful on the surface, but these conditions breed unrest and revolution. Passive peacekeeping does not prevent future conflict—it merely postpones it until tensions boil over.

Negative vs. Positive Peace: A More Accurate Framework

The Norwegian sociologist Johan Galtung introduced a critical distinction between negative peace and positive peace that challenges the assumption of peace as a fixed state.

- Negative Peace refers to the mere absence of war or violence. While this may seem desirable, it is inherently unstable because it does not address the root causes of conflict. A society may not be fighting a war, but if systemic injustice, economic disparity, or social tensions remain unresolved, it is only a matter of time before conflict re-emerges.
- Positive Peace is a deeper, sustainable peace that eliminates the underlying causes of violence and promotes justice, stability, and cooperation. It involves economic fairness, political inclusivity, reconciliation, and long-term structural change.

Many historical examples demonstrate the fragility of negative peace and the necessity of positive peace. The American Civil War ended in 1865, yet racial segregation and discrimination persisted for a century, leading to renewed civil unrest in the 1960s. The mere absence of war did not equate to peace; true peace required fundamental changes in civil rights, law, and cultural attitudes.

Similarly, many post-colonial nations achieved independence from imperial rule without descending into immediate war, yet their internal struggles—economic exploitation, ethnic divisions, and political instability—continued long after the formal end of colonial occupation. Without positive peace, the seeds of future conflict remain.

Historical Illusions of Peace

Several well-known periods in history that were considered “peaceful” upon closer examination reveal the limitations of the traditional concept of peace.

Pax Romana: Peace Through Military Dominance

The Pax Romana (27 BC – 180 AD) is often cited as an era of relative peace across the Roman Empire. However, this "peace" was enforced through military power, conquest, and suppression of resistance. Rome maintained control through force, crushing revolts and imposing its rule on conquered peoples. While this created temporary stability, it was neither just nor sustainable—resistance movements continued to rise, and when Rome's power weakened, the empire ultimately collapsed into chaos.

Post-World War Peace Treaties: Temporary Stability Leading to Future Wars

The aftermath of both World War I and World War II saw extensive diplomatic efforts to secure peace through treaties and international agreements. However, many of these arrangements were short-term fixes rather than long-term solutions. The Treaty of Versailles, as previously discussed, imposed harsh penalties on Germany that fostered resentment and contributed to the rise of the Nazi regime. Similarly, the Cold War emerged immediately after World War II, demonstrating that peace between nations does not necessarily mean the absence of geopolitical struggle.

The Cold War: A Fragile Equilibrium Built on the Fear of Destruction

The Cold War (1947–1991) is another case study in illusory peace. While there was no direct war between the United States and the Soviet Union, the world was not truly at peace. Instead, it existed in a state of constant tension, ideological conflict, and indirect warfare through proxy battles. The threat of mutually assured destruction (MAD) may have prevented full-scale war, but it did not eliminate hostility, competition, or suffering. In fact, the Cold War's instability led to numerous smaller wars in Vietnam, Korea, Afghanistan, and Latin America, as well as oppressive regimes supported by both superpowers.

Conclusion of This Section

The failure to recognize peace as a fragile, dynamic, and active process has led to repeated cycles of war and conflict throughout history. Peace cannot simply be declared; it must be built and maintained. It is not enough to stop fighting; true peace requires justice, reconciliation, and the elimination of underlying tensions.

If peace is to be more than a fleeting illusion, humanity must abandon the simplistic notion that peace is a fixed state. Instead, peace must be understood as a living, evolving process that requires continuous effort, wisdom, and sacrifice. It is not something that happens on its own—it must be chosen, created, and actively sustained.

3. The Counterintuitive Nature of Peace

Many believe that peace is the natural state of human society and that war is an aberration—a deviation from what should be. However, history and human nature suggest otherwise. Peace is not passive or self-sustaining; it does not simply exist in the absence of conflict. Instead, peace requires continuous effort, strategic action, and at times, even struggle. The greatest paradox of peace is that achieving and maintaining it often involves choices that seem, on the surface, contradictory.

Peace Requires Constant Action, Vigilance, and Sometimes Confrontation

If peace were passive, it would not be so easily lost. The reality is that peace is fragile, always at risk of unraveling due to internal and external pressures. This is why it demands constant action, renewal, and reinforcement—not just through treaties and negotiations, but through the continuous cultivation of justice, stability, and security.

Even in times of relative peace, vigilance is required to prevent the resurgence of tensions. Nations and societies that assume peace is permanent tend to neglect the very foundations that sustain it, allowing conditions for future conflict to take root. For example, the period of peace following World War II was not sustained by inaction but by active measures such as economic recovery programs (e.g., the Marshall Plan), diplomatic alliances (e.g., NATO), and structural reforms to prevent another global war.

Furthermore, in many cases, securing peace requires confrontation—not necessarily military confrontation, but resistance to forces that threaten it. Oppressive regimes, radical ideologies, and unchecked aggression can grow in the absence of firm opposition. A nation or society that refuses to defend its own peace becomes vulnerable to external and internal threats.

This raises an unsettling paradox: can peace be secured through struggle? The answer is not simple. History suggests that while conflict can be a tool to protect or restore peace, war fought for the wrong reasons or with the wrong methods can destroy the very peace it seeks to secure.

The Paradox of Peace: When Struggle Is Necessary and When It Is Destructive

Throughout history, some wars have been fought with the goal of preserving or establishing peace. However, war is an unpredictable force—once unleashed, it often exceeds its original purpose, leading to destruction that undermines any hope for stability.

The American Civil War (1861–1865) is an example of a conflict fought to resolve a fundamental moral and existential divide—the issue of slavery. While war is brutal, and no rational society seeks it, the war resulted in the abolition of slavery and the preservation of the United States. In contrast, World War I (1914–1918) was fought for a complex web of alliances and imperial ambitions, leading not to a lasting peace but to conditions that fostered World War II.

This paradox forces us to confront difficult moral questions:

- When is conflict justified in the pursuit of peace?
- How can the use of force be prevented from turning into perpetual violence?
- Is true peace ever possible if it requires struggle to achieve?

The mistake of many failed peace efforts is the assumption that war can be waged without long-term consequences. The ancient idea of a "war to end all wars" has never proven true—military victories often sow the seeds of future conflicts.

Why Compromise Can Be Dangerous

In many cases, compromise is seen as the ideal path to peace—but this is not always the case. Some conflicts are not just negotiable disputes but deep moral divides where compromise is viewed as betrayal.

For example, during the American Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s, activists pushing for desegregation and equal rights were often told to seek "gradual change" and "compromise" with segregationists. However, for African Americans

who had suffered under institutionalized racism, such compromises were not seen as progress but as a continuation of oppression. True peace required justice, not merely a delay of conflict.

Similarly, peace agreements that attempt to "split the difference" between deeply opposed sides often fail because neither side sees justice in the compromise. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict, for instance, has been marked by repeated peace proposals that fail to address the core existential and territorial claims of both parties. In such cases, peace is not simply a matter of negotiation; it is a matter of fundamentally transforming the conditions that make peace impossible.

The Nonlinear, Unpredictable Path to Peace

A major reason why peace is so difficult to achieve is that it does not follow a simple, linear progression. Many assume that peace emerges through logical steps—ending violence, making agreements, fostering cooperation. However, in reality, peace often arises through unpredictable, emergent shifts in society, power, and human consciousness.

In complex systems—whether political, social, or ecological—stability is not achieved through single actions but through dynamic balance. Minor events, such as economic shocks, political assassinations, or technological breakthroughs, can dramatically alter the course of history in ways no one anticipated. The fall of the Soviet Union was not the result of a single diplomatic strategy but a cascade of economic, ideological, and social shifts that suddenly collapsed an entire global power structure.

This means that peace is not a single goal to be achieved, but a constantly shifting state that must be adapted to changing conditions. Leaders and peacemakers who fail to anticipate complexity often find their efforts undone by unforeseen developments.

Historical Case Studies: Lessons from Peace Achieved and Peace Lost

The Failure of Appeasement Before World War II

One of the clearest examples of the misjudgment of peace was the policy of appeasement toward Nazi Germany in the 1930s. European leaders, particularly British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, sought to prevent war by making

concessions to Adolf Hitler, believing that compromise would satisfy his expansionist ambitions. The Munich Agreement of 1938 allowed Germany to annex parts of Czechoslovakia in exchange for a promise of no further aggression.

This was based on the assumption that Hitler could be reasoned with, and that peace was best maintained through dialogue rather than confrontation. However, Hitler viewed appeasement as weakness, not diplomacy. Within a year, Germany invaded Poland, triggering World War II.

The lesson here is that peace built on illusion is fragile. Appeasement can be a necessary strategy in some cases, but when it enables aggression rather than containing it, it leads to greater destruction.

The Violent Resistance That Led to Reconciliation: South Africa's Post-Apartheid Peace Process

While appeasement failed in Nazi Germany, another approach to securing peace—resistance leading to reconciliation—succeeded in South Africa.

For decades, the South African apartheid regime upheld white supremacy through racial segregation, economic control, and violence. The African National Congress (ANC), led by figures like Nelson Mandela, initially sought peaceful protest but later turned to armed resistance when all other methods failed. Mandela was imprisoned for nearly three decades, but his vision for peace was not one of passive submission—it was a determined effort to dismantle an unjust system without descending into civil war.

By the late 1980s and early 1990s, a series of nonlinear events shifted South Africa toward peace. Economic pressure, international sanctions, and changing domestic politics led to negotiations between the government and the ANC. What followed was a negotiated transition to democracy, culminating in Mandela's election as the first Black president of South Africa in 1994.

Unlike Germany in the 1930s, where appeasement led to disaster, South Africa's peace process combined resistance with reconciliation, ensuring that justice and peace were not in opposition but in balance.

Conclusion of This Section

Peace is neither automatic nor linear. It is full of paradoxes—it sometimes requires struggle, it can be disrupted by misguided compromise, and it often emerges in unpredictable ways. The assumption that peace follows a straightforward path has led to repeated failures in history. A true understanding of peace must embrace complexity, acknowledge moral imperatives, and recognize that sustaining peace requires constant, active engagement.

4. Peace as an Emergent and Fragile Phenomenon

Peace is often treated as a goal—a final state that, once reached, will sustain itself indefinitely. However, history and human behavior suggest that peace is not a permanent condition but an emergent and fragile equilibrium that must be actively maintained. Unlike war, which often follows clear strategic objectives, peace does not have a single, predictable pathway. It is shaped by countless interacting forces—political, economic, psychological, and cultural—each capable of shifting its course unexpectedly.

Understanding peace as an emergent rather than a fixed phenomenon changes how we approach its preservation. It forces us to recognize that peace does not simply remain intact once established; rather, it must be constantly reinforced, monitored, and adapted to new challenges. It is not the default state of human civilization but an anomaly—something that exists only when carefully balanced.

Peace as a Delicate Equilibrium, Not a Final Destination

In every known civilization, peace has been temporary and precarious. The moments of relative stability we call peace have always been held together by economic prosperity, military deterrence, cultural cohesion, or strategic alliances—any of which can shift or collapse.

- The Golden Age of Athens (5th century BC) was shattered by the Peloponnesian War.
- The Pax Romana (27 BC–180 AD) relied on Roman military dominance, which eventually crumbled.

- The European balance of power before World War I lasted for decades, only to implode when diplomatic failures led to total war.

These examples reveal that peace does not sustain itself—it exists only so long as the conditions supporting it remain in place. When those conditions shift—whether due to political instability, economic collapse, or cultural division—peace quickly unravels.

This is why peace must be actively maintained, not passively assumed. A society that treats peace as a given is one that risks losing it.

Complex Systems Theory Applied to Peace

Peace functions similarly to a complex system—a dynamic network of interdependent parts that can shift unpredictably. Just as ecological systems require continuous adjustment to maintain balance, so too does peace.

1. Peace is inherently unstable—it requires constant feedback and correction.
    - No peace agreement, political system, or social order is self-sustaining.
    - Stability requires constant monitoring, adaptation, and reinforcement.
2. Small disruptions can cause major collapses.
    - In ecological systems, a minor environmental change (like the loss of a key species) can trigger large-scale instability.
    - In economic systems, a single banking failure can set off a global financial crisis.
    - In geopolitics, a seemingly minor diplomatic dispute can escalate into war.

The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in 1914 is a prime example—an event that might have otherwise been insignificant, but in the context of an already fragile political order, it triggered World War I.

Likewise, modern conflicts often begin not with large-scale invasions but with gradual shifts—economic strain, cultural polarization, or ideological radicalization—all of which can accumulate until a tipping point is reached.

This means that maintaining peace requires constant adjustments. Just as an ecosystem requires careful management to prevent collapse, societies must continuously work to address inequality, resentment, and instability before they spiral out of control.

The Psychology of Peace: Why People Fear Stability

One of the most counterintuitive aspects of peace is that many people are uncomfortable with it. While most individuals claim to desire peace, the absence of conflict can create a sense of unease or even purposelessness. This is because war and conflict—though destructive—provide identity, unity, and meaning in ways that peace often does not.

The "Eternal Enemies" Mindset: Why Groups Cling to Conflict

Throughout history, groups and nations have defined themselves in opposition to others. The idea of an eternal enemy provides a clear sense of purpose:

- During the Cold War, the U.S. and the Soviet Union saw each other as existential threats, sustaining their respective political and military structures.
- In the Middle East, long-standing ethnic and religious rivalries create cycles of revenge and retaliation that make peace difficult.
- Even in domestic politics, ideological polarization often thrives on identifying an enemy rather than solving problems.

When external conflicts fade, groups often turn inward, seeking new sources of division. This explains why many societies that achieve peace later fracture due to internal struggles over power, identity, and ideology.

Why Peace Often Feels Unnatural

War and conflict activate primal survival instincts—they provide an immediate sense of urgency, unity, and direction. Peace, by contrast, can feel ambiguous, directionless, even empty.

- War unites societies against a common enemy. Peace requires cooperation, which is harder to sustain.
- War creates strong emotional bonds among those who fight together. Peace requires relationships built on compromise, which feel weaker.
- War produces clear narratives of good vs. evil. Peace requires navigating moral complexity, which many find uncomfortable.

This is why, paradoxically, some societies fall back into war even when peace is an option—because conflict provides a stronger sense of purpose.

The Danger of Believing Peace Is Inevitable

One of the most dangerous assumptions in human history has been the belief that peace, once achieved, is permanent. This mindset leads societies to neglect the very structures that sustain peace, allowing conflict to resurface.

1. Complacency leads to vulnerability.
    - After the Cold War ended in 1991, many believed that major conflicts were a thing of the past. The phrase "the end of history" was popularized, suggesting that liberal democracy and economic globalization had made large-scale wars obsolete.
    - However, this complacency ignored deep-seated economic and political tensions—leading to new conflicts in the Middle East, Russia's aggression against Ukraine, and a rise in authoritarianism worldwide.
2. Failure to recognize warning signs.
    - The 1930s saw the world emerge from World War I into what seemed like a new era of diplomacy. Many dismissed the rise of fascist leaders like Hitler and Mussolini as regional concerns, assuming that large-scale war was unlikely.
    - By the time global powers realized the danger, war had already become inevitable.

3. The illusion that peace is self-sustaining.
    - Many modern nations assume that economic prosperity and technological advancement alone will prevent war. However, history shows that even highly developed societies are not immune to instability.
    - The Roman Empire, the British Empire, and the Soviet Union all believed in their own permanence—until they collapsed.

If peace is fragile, then it must be defended—not through war, but through constant vigilance, adaptation, and wise governance.

Conclusion of This Section

Peace is not a default condition but a rare and delicate balance that requires constant effort to maintain. Unlike war, which is often the result of clear strategic decisions, peace is an emergent property that arises from a complex interplay of stability, justice, and societal cohesion.

The failure to recognize peace as fragile has led to repeated cycles of collapse in human history. If we are to build a lasting peace, we must:

- Acknowledge its complexity—peace is not a single achievement but a continuous process.
- Reject complacency—peace is never permanent unless actively preserved.
- Challenge the psychology of conflict—human nature resists peace, so peace must be intentionally fostered.

A true understanding of peace must go beyond simple idealism. It must recognize that peace is a living system—one that can only survive if societies, leaders, and individuals commit to sustaining it through wisdom, vigilance, and moral courage.

5. The Duty of Peacemakers and the Role of the Children of God

Throughout history, peace has often been viewed as a political or military goal—something to be negotiated between nations or imposed through force. However, in the teachings of Jesus, peace is not merely a geopolitical strategy but a divine

calling. It is not the absence of conflict, nor is it simply the prevention of war. True peace—the kind that endures and transforms—requires a particular kind of person: the peacemaker.

Jesus declared, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." (Matthew 5:9). This statement is not a vague endorsement of peace as an ideal; it is a specific and active command. The children of God are not simply those who avoid conflict or desire peace, but those who actively work to create it—even when it is difficult, costly, or unpopular.

This distinction between passive peacekeeping and active peacemaking is critical. The world has many peacekeepers—those who try to maintain the status quo, prevent immediate violence, or broker temporary truces. But the world has far fewer peacemakers—those who transform the very conditions that make conflict inevitable.

Peace Requires Active Engagement, Not Passive Waiting

There is a tendency to view peace as something that will eventually happen on its own, as if the natural course of civilization is toward harmony. This assumption is dangerously misleading. If history has shown anything, it is that peace does not sustain itself. The idea that peace will naturally emerge if left alone is a comforting illusion, but it is not supported by reality.

Peace must be actively pursued, cultivated, and defended. It requires confronting the forces that seek to exploit division and fuel hostility. It demands confronting the systems that allow war, oppression, and injustice to flourish. Those who assume that peace can be maintained without action—without personal and collective responsibility—fail to grasp the depth of the challenge.

This is why Jesus did not say "Blessed are the peaceful," but "Blessed are the peacemakers." It is not enough to want peace; one must be willing to fight for it—not with weapons, but with truth, wisdom, and moral courage.

The Children of God Are Peacemakers, Not Just Peacekeepers

The world often celebrates those who "keep the peace" by maintaining order. However, peacekeeping and peacemaking are not the same.

- Peacekeepers try to prevent conflict by maintaining the existing balance of power. They seek stability, even if that means upholding unjust systems.
- Peacemakers challenge injustice, transform systems, and create conditions where real peace—rooted in justice and righteousness—can emerge.

This difference is crucial. Many so-called "peacemaking" efforts throughout history have been mere attempts to freeze conflict rather than resolve it. The world has seen countless peace treaties, ceasefires, and negotiations that provided temporary relief but failed to address the root causes of war and division. This is because they were not true peacemaking efforts—they were peacekeeping measures designed to prevent immediate escalation rather than transform the world.

The Children of God are not called to maintain the status quo. They are called to bring about real, lasting peace, which requires a radical transformation of the world's priorities, values, and systems.

Spiritual Principles of Peacemaking

The work of peacemaking is not merely political or social—it is spiritual. The forces that oppose peace are not just armies and governments but greed, fear, pride, and hatred. To be a true peacemaker requires more than strategy; it requires a particular spiritual posture.

1. Humility—Acknowledging the Depth of Conflict and Not Oversimplifying Solutions
    - True peacemakers do not assume that peace is simple.
    - They recognize that conflicts have deep historical, economic, and spiritual roots.
    - They refuse to impose quick fixes or superficial compromises that do not address the heart of the issue.
2. Courage—Standing Firm Against Those Who Profit from War and Division
    - Peacemakers must be willing to confront the forces that thrive on conflict—governments, corporations, ideologies, and individuals who benefit from keeping people divided.

    - This requires great courage, because those who profit from war will always resist those who seek peace.
    - Jesus himself faced opposition for preaching peace—not because peace was undesirable, but because it threatened the power of those who controlled the world through fear and violence.
3. Patience—Understanding That Peace Is a Long and Difficult Process, Not an Instant Event
    - Peace does not come quickly. It requires long-term commitment and perseverance.
    - Many conflicts take generations to resolve. Peacemakers must be willing to plant seeds of peace that they may never see fully grow.
    - True peace is not forced—it is built over time through justice, reconciliation, and transformation.

These principles make true peacemaking extremely difficult. That is why it is the Children of God who are called to this work—because it requires a divine perspective, one that is not bound by immediate results or short-term victories but by the commitment to a greater and eternal truth.

Jesus' Peace Is Different from the World's Peace

Jesus made a profound statement about peace:

"Peace I leave with you; my peace I give to you. Not as the world gives do I give to you." (John 14:27)

This is one of the most important distinctions in all of Scripture. Jesus' peace is different from the world's peace. The peace of the world is always fragile, always conditional, always dependent on political stability, economic prosperity, or military force. But Jesus' peace is not fragile.

- It does not rely on external conditions.
    - The world believes peace is only possible when circumstances are ideal.

    - Jesus' peace is not dependent on politics, economics, or social stability.
    - It is a peace that exists even in suffering, even in chaos, even in persecution.
- It is sustained through faith, wisdom, and endurance.
    - Jesus' peace does not disappear when war threatens, when injustice rises, or when suffering increases.
    - It is a peace rooted in God’s sovereignty, in the knowledge that the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than the kingdoms of this world.

This is why the peacemakers—the true Children of God—do not despair, even when the world rejects peace. They know that their work is not in vain, even if peace seems impossible in their time.

Conclusion of This Section

The work of peacemaking is sacred work, and it belongs to those who are willing to bear its burden with faith, courage, and perseverance.

- Peace is not passive—it must be actively pursued.
- Peace is not about maintaining the status quo—it is about transforming the world.
- Peace is not weak—it is the greatest act of strength.

The Children of God are not peacekeepers in the sense of preserving temporary stability. They are peacemakers, those who forge a new way forward, even when the world resists.

To be a peacemaker is to stand in the tension between the world’s brokenness and God’s promise of restoration—to live in the reality of war and suffering while never giving up on the reality of peace. It is to bring peace where none exists, to challenge injustice, and to walk forward even when the world refuses to follow.

This is why Jesus called the peacemakers blessed—because their work, though difficult, is the very work of God.

6. Conclusion: The Eternal Duty of Peace

Peace is never final. It is not a destination that can be reached and held forever, nor is it a static condition that, once achieved, will sustain itself. Peace is always in motion, always being built, and always at risk of being undone. It is a fragile state, not because it is weak, but because it requires constant engagement, adaptation, and sacrifice.

This does not mean that the work of peace is futile. On the contrary, the fact that peace must be continuously chosen makes it one of the most profound and meaningful human endeavors. The impermanence of peace does not make it any less worthy; it makes it more so. The duty of peacemaking is not to achieve a final, unshakable peace but to ensure that peace never disappears, that it is never forgotten, and that it always has those willing to carry its burden.

The Moment of Choice: Collapsing One Universe from the Multiverse

Every moment in history presents a choice. Each decision—whether personal, political, or global—collapses a single reality from the infinite possibilities that could have been. If all possible worlds exist in a multiverse of potential outcomes, then peace is not something that simply emerges on its own—it is something that must be selected.

In every moment, we must ask:

- Do we choose a world where peace is pursued, or a world where conflict is inevitable?
- Do we choose reconciliation, or do we choose division?
- Do we choose wisdom, or do we allow fear to dictate our actions?

At every turning point, we collapse one reality from many. The future is not preordained—it is shaped by the choices we make in the present. And if that is true, then peace is not simply a possibility; it is a choice that must be made again and again.

If Peace Is Counterintuitive, Then It Requires Those Who Can See Beyond Conflict

Peace is difficult because it runs against many of our instincts. Our minds are wired for survival, for self-preservation, for defending against threats both real

and imagined. In many cases, war and conflict feel more natural than peace because they provide clear lines of identity: an enemy, a cause, a sense of purpose. Peace requires a deeper vision—one that sees beyond immediate threats and into the higher reality of human unity.

The world does not naturally drift toward peace. It drifts toward entropy, toward division, toward cycles of conflict that repeat throughout history. This is why peace requires those who can see past the illusion that conflict is inevitable—those who can envision a different path and are willing to walk it, even when others cannot yet see where it leads.

Jesus understood this when he said, “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God” (Matthew 5:9). The peacemakers are those who, despite everything, refuse to accept that war, suffering, and injustice are the final state of humanity. They are those who work to bend the trajectory of history toward reconciliation, even when the world insists that war is the only answer.

The Work of Peace Is Never Finished, But It Is Never in Vain

If peace must always be chosen, then it follows that peace is never completed. There will never be a moment in human history where we can say, "It is done. We have achieved peace, and we no longer need to fight for it."

But this does not mean that the struggle is pointless. If peace can never be fully achieved, then the real measure of success is not in reaching an end but in ensuring that the work never ceases.

The world has never seen a lasting peace, but neither has it seen peace fully extinguished.

- As long as there are those who seek peace, it will never be lost.
- As long as there are those who stand against violence, peace will always have defenders.
- As long as there are those who remember that peace is possible, the world will never fully descend into chaos.

This is the eternal duty of peacemakers—not to secure peace once and for all, but to ensure that peace remains possible, that it is never forgotten, that it always has those willing to bear its weight.

We Do Not Need to Reach the End—Only to Always Do Everything Possible

If history has taught us that peace is impermanent, then it has also taught us something equally important: every effort for peace matters, even if it does not last.

We may not see the results of our work. We may not live to witness a world without war, without suffering, without injustice. But that does not diminish the value of the work itself. It is enough to know that we have done all that we can—that in every moment, when given the choice, we have chosen peace.

- We do not need to reach the end.
- We do not need to see the completion of our efforts.
- We only need to know that we have done everything possible, and that in doing so, we have left the world one step closer to peace than it was before.

If peace is never final, then the duty of peacemakers is eternal. But as long as there are those who choose it, peace will never be lost.

References

Sacred Texts and Theological Works

- The Holy Bible, English Standard Version (ESV). (2001). Crossway.
- Augustine of Hippo. (*City of God*). (5th century). Various translations.
- Aquinas, Thomas. (*Summa Theologica*). (13th century). Various translations.

Philosophical and Ethical Discussions on Peace

- Kant, Immanuel. (*Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*). (1795).
- Tolstoy, Leo. (*The Kingdom of God Is Within You*). (1894).
- Arendt, Hannah. (*The Origins of Totalitarianism*). (1951).

Historical and Political Studies on Peace and Conflict

- Galtung, Johan. (*Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization*). (1996).
- Kissinger, Henry. (*Diplomacy*). (1994).
- Nye, Joseph S. (*The Future of Power*). (2011).
- Tuchman, Barbara. (*The Guns of August*). (1962).
- Ferguson, Niall. (*The War of the World: Twentieth-Century Conflict and the Descent of the West*). (2006).

Case Studies in Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution

- Mandela, Nelson. (*Long Walk to Freedom*). (1994).
- King Jr., Martin Luther. (*Why We Can't Wait*). (1964).
- Sharp, Gene. (*From Dictatorship to Democracy: A Conceptual Framework for Liberation*). (1993).
- Hedges, Chris. (*War Is a Force That Gives Us Meaning*). (2002).

Psychology and Sociology of Peace and Conflict

- Pinker, Steven. (*The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined*). (2011).
- Harari, Yuval Noah. (*Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind*). (2014).
- Tversky, Amos, & Kahneman, Daniel. (*Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*). (1974).

Complex Systems and Emergent Order in Peace Studies

- Taleb, Nassim Nicholas. (*Antifragile: Things That Gain from Disorder*). (2012).
- Mitchell, Melanie. (*Complexity: A Guided Tour*). (2009).
- Kauffman, Stuart. (*At Home in the Universe: The Search for the Laws of Self-Organization and Complexity*). (1995).